



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/352,612	07/13/1999	ARIE HENDRIK FRANS VAN VLIET	102222.01	2506

25944 7590 07/15/2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC  
P.O. BOX 19928  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER
----------

KILKENNY, TODD J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1733

25

DATE MAILED: 07/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/352,612

Applicant(s)

VAN VLIET ET AL.

Examiner

Todd J. Kilkenny

Art Unit

1733

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 13 June 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-7 and 13-23.


Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 9-12.

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet

Continuation of 10. Other: Applicant's amendment and remarks have been entered for purposes of Appeal. In response to applicant's arguments against Van Vliet, the examiner is not persuaded. As applicant addresses, Van Vliet teaches embedding absorbing particles in a surface of a weldable plastic strip such that during welding almost only the region containing these particles is melted, so that outside the region containing the absorption particles disorientation of the strips is largely or even usually absent. The examiner agrees with this statement. However, applicant argues that the melted region comprising the absorption particle defines the entire zone of overlap between crossed strips in a mat and therefore does not teach spatially separated bonding points. The examiner disagrees. It is the examiner's position that the regions of melting as disclosed by Van Vliet are the regions directly comprising the absorption particles. In disclosing to embed said particles, Van Vliet suggests that the absorption particles are embedded in the surface of elements to be welded in such a quantity that the distance between adjacent absorption particles is smaller than the thickness of the surface layer that contains the absorption particles (page 5, lines 21 – 27). Therefore, Van Vliet clearly identifies that the embedded particles are spaced from each other. This spacing suggests that the entire zone of overlap in the mat as disclosed would also comprise spaced absorption particles and therefore have regions within the zone of overlap that do not contain absorption particles and therefore are not melted. This, in the examiner's position, defines spatially separated bonding points.

T/K

7/8/03

  
JEFF H. AFTERGUT  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1300

# Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/352,612

Applicant(s)

VAN VLIET ET AL.

Examiner

Todd J. Kilkenny

Art Unit

1733

## All Participants:

(1) Todd J. Kilkenny.

(2) Stephen Catlin.

## Status of Application: After Final

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 7 July 2003

Time: \_\_\_\_\_

## Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

## Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

## Part II.

### SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*Applicant was informed that the after final response was entered, but failed to place the application in condition for allowance.*

## Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)